

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.

h



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,904	03/13/2002	Avi Fuks	019497-003310US	3621

20350 7590 07/09/2004

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/099,904

Applicant(s)

FUKS ET AL.

Examiner

Luke S. Wassum

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 March 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>07012004</u> . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

The Invention

1. The claimed invention is a method for scoring indexing concepts for their relevancy in the context, including a collection of documents, classifying the collection of documents to a set if indexing concepts and scoring each indexing concept according to the relevancy of the indexing concept to the collection of documents.

Election/Restrictions

2. The following restriction was required by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. 121:
- I. Claims 1-36 and 38-43, drawn to a method of scoring indexing concepts for their relevancy in the context, classified in class 707, subclass 3.
 - II. Claims 37 and 44, drawn to a method of providing targeted advertisements, classified in class 705, subclass 27.
3. The examiner contacted attorney Patrick Boucher on 1 July 2004, who elected the claims of Group I without traverse.

However, after beginning examination, the prior art used to reject the claims of the elected group was also applicable to the claims of the non-elected group. Since the examination of the claims of the non-elected group would thus impose no additional burden on the examiner, the requirement for restriction is withdrawn.

Priority

4. The Applicants' claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e), based on provisional application 60/275,839, filed 14 March 2001, is acknowledged.
5. Since there is material present in the instant application that did not appear in the disclosure of provisional application 60/275,839 (particularly, the disclosure and claims associated with the television program embodiment of the invention, as depicted by Figures 5 and 6), this new material will not gain the benefit of the priority date of said provisional application, but instead will have a priority date of 13 March 2002, the filing date of the application. All claims and disclosure that are supported by the provisional application will have a priority date of 14 March 2001.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1 as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "Server", with element 15 of Fig. 1, would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A descriptive textual label for each numbered element in these figures would be needed to better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be labeled in the drawing. Optionally, the applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o), recited below:

"(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject

Art Unit: 2177

to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office. They should contain as few words as possible."

Specification

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

There is a typographical error on page 9, line 1: "These score are..." should be "These *scores* are...".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 1, 7-10, 19, 29-32, 38 and 40 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The claims use inconsistent terminology to refer to the different claimed steps, with some claims referring to them as one, two, etc., and some referring to them as a, b, c, etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 22 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The examiner believes that claim 22 was intended to be dependent upon claim 19, but is instead dependent upon claim 21, which contains the identical limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-10, 12, 14-18, 38, 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Krellenstein** (U.S. Patent 5,924,090).

12. Regarding claim 1, **Krellenstein** teaches a method for scoring indexing concepts for their relevancy in the context as claimed, comprising:

- a) obtaining a collection of documents (see citation of the search result list, col. 5, lines 4-8);
- b) classifying the collection of documents to a set of indexing concepts (see the identification of a candidate category list, col. 5, lines 8-13); and
- c) scoring each indexing concept according to at least the relevancy of the indexing concept to said collection of documents (see the disclosure of the weighting of candidate categories, col. 5, lines 13-23).

13. Regarding claim 38, **Krellenstein** teaches a system including a computer and associated memory for scoring indexing concepts for their relevancy in the context as claimed, the system configured to perform the following, including:

- a) obtaining a collection of documents (see citation of the search result list, col. 5, lines 4-8);
- b) classifying the collection of documents to a set of indexing concepts (see the identification of a candidate category list, col. 5, lines 8-13); and
- c) scoring each indexing concept according to at least the relevancy of the indexing concept to said collection of documents (see the disclosure of the weighting of candidate categories, col. 5, lines 13-23).

14. Regarding claim 2, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said indexing concepts are categories arranged in a hierarchy (see col. 9, lines 15-32).

15. Regarding claims 3 and 4, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said collection of documents is obtained as a result of a query (see col. 4, line 64 through col. 5, line 3).

16. Regarding claims 5 and 6, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method further comprising the step of displaying or not each one of said indexing concepts depending upon at least its respective indexing concept score (see disclosure that the candidate categories having the highest weight are displayed to the user, col. 5, lines 13-23).

17. Regarding claims 7, 8 and 39, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method and system wherein said step (a) includes obtaining document relevancy scores in the context (see disclosure

Art Unit: 2177

that search results are ranked according to relevancy criteria, col. 6, lines 49-52), said step (b) includes obtaining document-category classification scores (see disclosure of the assignment of documents to categories, necessarily including the claimed obtaining of document-category scores, col. 8, lines 56-65), and said step (c) includes calculating category relevancy scores in the context as a function of at least said document relevancy scores in the context and said document-category classification scores (see col. 5, lines 13-23; see also col. 6, lines 17-21).

18. Regarding claims 9 and 10, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said step (c) further includes taking into account at least one non-context related factor (see disclosure of rules designed to emphasize web-site categories, col. 8, lines 9-11).

19. Regarding claims 12 and 14, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said document-category classification scores are determined in a dynamic fashion (see col. 5, lines 4-6).

20. Regarding claims 15 and 16, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said function includes a scalar product (see col. 7, lines 37-40).

21. Regarding claims 17 and 18, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said function further takes into account relative size of group of documents within category (see col. 7, lines 37-40).

Art Unit: 2177

22. Regarding claim 42, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a computer program product that includes a computer program code configured to perform the steps of claim 1 (see discussion of Figure 1, col. 4, lines 25-39).

23. Claims 37 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Gupta et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,487,538).

24. Regarding claim 37, **Gupta et al.** teaches a method for real-time targeting of advertisements to viewers as claimed, comprising pushing distinct advertisements to distinct viewers substantially simultaneously according to the relevance of the distinct advertisements to the distinct viewers (see col. 4, lines 61-65).

25. Regarding claim 44, **Gupta et al.** additionally teaches a computer program product that includes a computer program code configured to perform the steps of claim 37 (see disclosure of the hardware and software, col. 7, line 6 through col. 8, line 40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

Art Unit: 2177

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

28. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

29. Claims 19-30, 33-36, 40, 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Krellenstein** (U.S. Patent 5,924,090) in view of **Gupta et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,487,538).

30. Regarding claim 19, **Krellenstein** teaches a method for propositions for their relevancy in the context as claimed, comprising:

- a) obtaining a collection of documents (see citation of the search result list, col. 5, lines 4-8);

- b) classifying the collection of documents to a set of indexing concepts (see the identification of a candidate category list, col. 5, lines 8-13); and
- c) scoring each indexing concept according to at least the relevancy of the indexing concept to said collection of documents (see the disclosure of the weighting of candidate categories, col. 5, lines 13-23).

Krellenstein does not explicitly teach a method including the step of scoring each proposition according to at least the relevancy of the proposition to the collection of the documents.

Gupta et al., however, teaches a method including the step of scoring each proposition according to at least the relevancy of the proposition to the collection of the documents (see col. 4, lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to score the propositions according to at least the relevancy of the proposition to the collection of the documents, since this would allow an advertiser to attempt to target audiences that would most likely be interested in the product or service being advertised (see col. 4, lines 37-44).

31. Regarding claim 40, **Krellenstein** teaches a system including a computer and associated memory for scoring indexing concepts for their relevancy in the context as claimed, the system configured to perform the following, including:

- a) obtaining a collection of documents (see citation of the search result list, col. 5, lines 4-8);

- b) classifying the collection of documents to a set of indexing concepts (see the identification of a candidate category list, col. 5, lines 8-13); and
- c) scoring each indexing concept according to at least the relevancy of the indexing concept to said collection of documents (see the disclosure of the weighting of candidate categories, col. 5, lines 13-23).

Krellenstein does not explicitly teach a method including the step of scoring each proposition according to at least the relevancy of the proposition to the collection of the documents.

Gupta et al., however, teaches a method including the step of scoring each proposition according to at least the relevancy of the proposition to the collection of the documents (see col. 4, lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to score the propositions according to at least the relevancy of the proposition to the collection of the documents, since this would allow an advertiser to attempt to target audiences that would most likely be interested in the product or service being advertised (see col. 4, lines 37-44).

32. Regarding claim 20, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said indexing concepts are categories arranged in a hierarchy (see col. 9, lines 15-32).

33. Regarding claims 21 and 22, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method wherein said collection of documents is obtained as a result of a query (see col. 4, line 64 through col. 5, line 3).

34. Regarding claims 23 and 24, **Gupta et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising the step of displaying or not each one of said propositions depending upon at least its respective propositions score (see col. 4, lines 61-65).

35. Regarding claims 25-28, **Gupta et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein said propositions include both business-related and non business-related proposals (see disclosure that advertisements are used as a revenue source [i.e., business-related], and also as a means of generating publicity and web site access [i.e., non business-related], col. 1, lines 21-24).

36. Regarding claims 29, 30 and 41, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a method and system wherein said step (a) includes obtaining document relevancy scores in the context (see disclosure that search results are ranked according to relevancy criteria, col. 6, lines 49-52), said step (b) includes obtaining document-category classification scores (see disclosure of the assignment of documents to categories, necessarily including the claimed obtaining of document-category scores, col. 8, lines 56-65), and said step (c) includes calculating category relevancy scores in the context as a function of at least said document relevancy scores in the context and said document-category classification scores (see col. 5, lines 13-23; see also col. 6, lines 17-21).

Furthermore, **Krellenstein's** disclosure of a method including document-category scores and category relevancy scores in context is analogous to the claimed proposition-category relevancy scores and proposition relevancy scores in context (when combined with the **Gupta et al.** reference), in that only those categories whose relevance exceeds a certain threshold are displayed to

the user, in the same way that the claimed invention only displays those propositions whose relevance to the user exceeds a certain threshold.

37. Regarding claims 33 and 34, **Krellenstein's** disclosure of a method including documents and document categories is analogous to the claimed method including television shows and categories (when combined with the **Gupta et al.** reference), in that only those categories whose relevance exceeds a certain threshold are displayed to the user, in the same way that the claimed invention only displays those propositions whose relevance to the user exceeds a certain threshold, based upon television programs watched (see disclosure that television commercials aired during cartoons often relate to children's toys, cereal, and other items that children would utilize, col. 4, lines 37-44).

38. Regarding claims 35 and 36, **Gupta et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein said collection of documents are a collection of cookie files and wherein said categories are a preference category of a group of people, and further comprising the step of promoting at least one proposition according to the respective relevance score in the context (see col. 4, line 66 through col. 5, line 16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize cookie files, since these files are indicative of a user's interests, and thus can be utilized in targeting advertisements of interest to a specific user (see col. 5, lines 6-10).

39. Regarding claim 43, **Krellenstein** additionally teaches a computer program product that includes a computer program code configured to perform the steps of claim 19 (see discussion of Figure 1, col. 4, lines 25-39).

40. Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Krellenstein** (U.S. Patent 5,924,090) in view of **Gupta et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,487,538) as applied to claims 19-30, 33-36, 40, 41 and 43 above, and further in view of **Hendricks et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,738,978).

41. Regarding claims 31 and 32, **Krellenstein** and **Gupta et al.** teach a method for scoring propositions for their relevance in the context substantially as claimed.

Neither **Krellenstein** nor **Gupta et al.** explicitly teaches a method wherein proposition significance is taken into account in calculating proposition relevancy scores.

Hendricks et al., however, teaches a method wherein proposition significance is taken into account in calculating proposition relevancy scores (see col. 37, lines 9-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use proposition significance as a factor in calculating proposition relevancy scores, since an advertiser that pays a higher fee should reasonably expect his or her advertisement to be aired more often than one that pays a lower fee.

42. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Krellenstein** (U.S. Patent 5,924,090) as applied to claims 1-10, 12, 14-18, 38, 39 and 42 above, and further in view of **Wical** (U.S. Patent 6,112,201).

43. Regarding claims 11 and 13, **Krellenstein** teaches a method for scoring indexing concepts for their relevancy in context substantially as claimed.

Krellenstein does not explicitly teach a method wherein the document-category classification scores are determined *a priori*.

Wical, however, teaches a method wherein the document-category classification scores are determined *a priori* (see disclosure of the virtual bookshelf, containing a plurality of source documents that are classified in a hierarchical structure of concepts and topics, col. 4, line 65 through col. 6, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to pre-determine document-classification scores, since this would allow a user the ability to rapidly locate documents of interest in a large repository (see col. 2, lines 14-33).

Conclusion

44. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mehrle (U.S. Patent 5,794,236) teaches a computer-based system for classifying documents into a hierarchy and linking the classifications to the hierarchy.

Prager (U.S. Patent 5,943,670) teaches a system for determining whether the best category for an object under investigation is a mixture of preexisting categories, and how the mixture is constituted.

Prager (U.S. Patent 6,003,027) teaches a system for determining confidence levels for the results of a categorization system.

Snow et al. (U.S. Patent 6,098,066) teaches a method for searching a document directory hierarchy which partitions a user-initiated search.

Marques (U.S. Patent 6,182,066) teaches a system for tailoring user queries and for categorizing and searching metadata about content provided on the Internet and/or intranet for delivery in accordance with customized user profiles.

Hearst (U.S. Patent 6,223,145) teaches an interactive interface for creating a search query for a corpus of machine-readable documents, each of which is associated with at least one category of a category hierarchy.

Wical (U.S. Patent 6,240,410) teaches a virtual bookshelf system that provides a user a way to browse and locate information associated with a plurality of documents.

Hearst et al. (U.S. Patent 6,297,824) teaches an interactive interface for creating a search query for a corpus of machine-readable documents, each of which is associated with at least one category of a category hierarchy.

Brady et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,430) teaches an automated method of generating and updating a database of resumes and related documents.

Woods et al. (U.S. Patent 6,510,417) teaches a method of providing voice access to Internet-based information and services including a signal indicating a communication connection request.

Eldering (U.S. Patent 6,560,578) teaches an advertisement selection system in which vectors describing an actual or hypothetical market for a product or desired viewing audience can be determined.

Hogg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,654,743) teaches a method for clustering documents from a set of documents including issuing a request from an electronic device for documents which are relevant to the request.

Sellink et al. (U.S. Patent 6,687,734) teaches a method of determining if one web site has the same information as another web site.

Li (U.S. Patent 6,691,108) teaches a focused search engine directed to crawling vast search spaces comprising markup language documents.

Lewis ("An Evaluation of Phrasal and Clustered Representations on a Text Categorization Task") teaches the properties of phrasal and clustered indexing languages on a text categorization task.

Tzeras et al. ("Automatic Indexing Based on Bayesian Inference Networks") teaches a Bayesian inference network model for automatic indexing with index terms from a prescribed vocabulary.

Lewis et al. ("A Comparison of Two Learning Algorithms for Text Categorization") teaches empirical results on the text categorization performance of two purely inductive learning algorithms.

Apté et al. ("Towards Language Independent Automated Learning of Text Categorization Models") teaches the results of extensive machine learning experiments on large collections of Reuters' English and German newswires.

Wiener et al. ("A Neural Network Approach to Topic Spotting") teaches an application of nonlinear neural networks to topic spotting.

Cohen ("Text Categorization and Relational Learning") teaches the first order learning system FOIL on a series of text categorization problems.

Iwayama et al. ("Cluster-Based Text Categorization: A Comparison of Category Search Strategies") teaches the evaluation of a cluster-based search with a probabilistic clustering algorithm.

Lewis et al. ("Training Algorithms for Linear Text Classifiers") teaches that experimental data shows that the Widrow-Hoff and EG algorithms are more effective than the widely used Roccio algorithm on several categorization and routing tasks.

Xu et al. ("Query Expansion Using Local and Global Document Analysis") teaches the effectiveness of techniques that analyze a corpus to discover word relationships and those that analyze documents retrieved by the initial query for automatic query expansion.

Chakrabarti et al. ("Using Taxonomy, Discriminants and Signatures for Navigating in Text Databases") teaches how to organize a text database hierarchically to aid better searching and browsing.

Cohen et al. ("Context-Sensitive Learning Methods for Text Categorization") teaches the evaluation of two recently implemented machine learning algorithms, RIPPER and sleeping-experts for phrases, on a number of large text categorization problems.

Hsu et al. ("Constructing Personal Digital Library by Multi-Search and Customized Category") teaches a personal digital library capable of efficiently retrieving information on the World Wide Web.

Feldman ("Northern Light Adds Link Popularity to Its Relevance Ranking Factors List") teaches the addition of a new factor in calculating search result rank in the Northern Light search engine.

PR Newswire ("LingoMotors Goes Live with TurboSearch at DEMO 2001") is a press release announcing the release of the TurboSearch product.

M2 Presswire ("LingoMotors Launches TurboCat Categorization Solution") is a press release announcing the release of the TurboCat product.

LingoMotors ("TurboCat: Advanced Methods, Dramatic Results") teaches an overview of the TurboCat product.

The following reference, while not qualifying as prior art, is also of interest:

Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0169770) teaches a method of categorizing a collection of documents into a hierarchy of categories that are defined by the collection of documents.

Kornai et al. ("Classifying the Hungarian Web") teaches lessons learned from building *vizsla*, the keyword search and topic classification system used on the largest Hungarian portal.

Art Unit: 2177


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 703-305-5706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 703-746-5658.

Customer Service for Tech Center 2100 can be reached during regular business hours at (703) 306-5631, or fax (703) 746-7240.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Luke S. Wassum
Art Unit 2177

lsw
7 July 2004